UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/963,812	09/26/2001	Jorg Gregor Schleicher	1104-032	1207	
	7590 04/29/200 TERRANOVA, P.L.L.	EXAMINER			
100 REGENCY	FOREST DRIVE	JABR, FADEY S			
SUITE 160 CARY, NC 275	518	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3628		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/29/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/963,812	SCHLEICHER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	FADET 3. JADK	3020	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 April 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	·	TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially re-	ducing or simplifying ti	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,	,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alle		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).			_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-29</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application ir	n condition for allowan	ce because:
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/JOHN W HAYES/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628			

Continuation of 13. Other: Examiner notes that periodiically sending subscription based content taken in the broadest reasonable interpretation is a content being transferred to users. Ricci discloses transferring content to users (0040). Page 8 pf the provisional application 60/252334 discloses file owners or entities that share fuiles to program the files to report royalties for advertising fees, report number of downloads vs actual opening of files, reports overall usage of a file's life span. Further, on page 8, Ricci discloses tracking and licensing of files. Also, on page 8, Ricci discloses track all end user destinations for determination of royalty payments. On Page 9, Ricci discloses The software trigger or digital acknowledgement trigger is sent to the servers which originate the file download or transfer, an advertising company is matched to the MPS on route to the user....The invention induced the software trigger...will send the commercials out based on the tag received to the end user simultaneously with the MP3 download (pp. 9-10). Therefore, the provisional application does qualify as prior art.

Further, Applicant argues that there is no suggesion to combine the references. Examiner asserts that Ricci and Ferguson et al. are both directed to charging and delivery of on-line content. Further, the combination of Ricci, Ferguson and Applican't admission of the prior art is valid. One of ordinary skill would be led to combine the references seeing as they all are directed to charging for content. Applicant also argues that Ricci does not teach or suggest monitoring the quantity of the content served. Examiner asserts that tracking which recipients have licensed which digital media is equivalent to monitoring the quantity of the content served. Examiner asserts that charging based on the number of uses is equivalent to charging based on the quantity of content served. In both cases an amount of content is delivered to a user, and in both cases the user is charged based on the amount of content that is delivered to the user. As taken in its broadest reasonable interpretation, "quantity" is believed to be equivalent to the number of uses.